15. (Unchanged) The call router system of claim 14 wherein the processor upon which the router executes is the managing processor.

16. (Unchanged) The call router system of claim 14 wherein the processor upon which the router executes is a processor connected to the LAN separate from the managing processor.

17. (Unchanged) The call router system of claim 14 wherein routing rules are maintained at the individual computer workstation and the router requests routing from the individual computer workstation.

18. (Unchanged) The call router system of claim 14 wherein routing rules for connected computer workstation are maintained separately on the processor connected to the LAN that executes the router, and wherein routing is accessed from the routing rules according to destination information for received calls.

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed November 19, 1998 in the above-referenced case. Original claims 1-7 are presented for examination. Claims 2 and 7 are objected to by the Examiner for informalities as stated in page 2, paragraph 1 and 2 of the Examiner's Office Letter. Claims 2-8 and 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meermans (U.S. Patent number: 5,712,901)

hereinafter Meermans. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meermans in view of McCalmont et al (US Patent 5,621,789) hereinafter McCalmont.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art provided by the Examiner. Applicant has herein amended claims 2 and 7 to overcome the Examiner's objections for informalities. Applicant presents strong arguments to clearly show the art of Meermans and McCalmont fail to support the Examiner's rejections.

Claim 2 as amended now recites:

2. A method for routing Internet Protocol Network Telephony (IPNT) calls at customer premises having a managing processor and computer workstations including video display units (VDUs) connected on a local area network (LAN) also coupled to the managing processor, the method comprising steps of:

(a) receiving an IPNT call at the managing processor;

(b) determining an intended recipient for the call among the computer workstations connected on the LAN;

(c) requesting routing from a set of current routing rules accessible and editable by the intended recipient; and

(d) routing the call according to the current routing rules of the intended recipient.

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Meermans. The Examiner states that Meermans teaches a message translation method for routing Internet Protocol Network

Telephony (IPNT) calls at a caller's mailbox (customer premises). The Examiner continues to state that Meermans teaches a Phone Mail Unit 104, or a text server, **304**, (managing processor) and computer workstations, **128**, including video display units (VDU's) connected on a control interface, **112**, a local area network (LAN) also coupled to the Phone Mail Unit or text server.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's statements regarding Meermans. Meermans does not teach an IPNT call routing system at all. Meermans clearly teaches a call messaging and translation system. A caller leaves a recorded message, when the caller disconnects the call the message may be routed (col. 5, lines 25-28). Meermans does not teach the ability to route a call as in applicant's claimed invention. Meermans clearly states received calls are from conventional voice telephones or text telephone units. Meermans does not suggest or teach the ability to receive IPNT calls. IPNT calls are generated on a network that sends information in data packets. The receiving processor must have the capability to translate the data packets. Meermans clearly does not teach that the Phone Mail Unit **104** has such a capability. Meermans clearly does not teach that the recipients receive calls on computer workstations as claimed in applicant's invention. Meermans console **128**, which the Examiner relates to applicant's computer workstations, is actually a facility for the communications assistant to translate a recorded message to be sent to a recipient's mailbox. Meermans makes no teaching or suggestion whatsoever that the recipient receives calls routed by the system on a computer workstation.

Applicant's claim 2 discloses specific steps used in order to route incoming IPNT calls that Meermans simply does not have the capability to do. Step (a) recites *receiving an IPNT call at the managing processor.* Meermans does not teach the ability to receive an IPNT call. Step (b)

recites *determining an intended recipient for the call among the computer workstations connected on the LAN.* Meermans does not determine a recipient of an incoming call among the computer workstations connected on the LAN. Meermans routes only recorded voice or text messages, not actual calls as in applicant's invention. Computer workstations are manned by communications assistants for translating recorded messages for routing to intended recipients. Console **128** in Meermans Fig. 3 is certainly not an intended recipient of a call. Step (c) recites *requesting routing from the a set of current routing rules accessible and editable by the intended recipient.* Meermans makes not mention or suggest whatsoever of routing rules being accessible and editable by the intended recipient. Meermans states the routing destinations for a recipient are determined when the account is set up for a recipient. Meermans clearly teaches no capability of a recipient to access Phone Mail Unit **104** to edit or change any routing rules. Step (d) recites *routing the call according to the current routing rules of the intended recipient.* Figure 3 of Meermans clearly shows only text messages having the capability of being routed to a destination other than a mailbox, ie. Pager, internet address or e-mail. Meermans does not have the capability of connecting an IPNT voice call to a recipient at a computer work station. Meermans is clearly limited to only routing a recorded text message to any destination other that a customer's mailbox. Routing rule changes are only determined by the recorded message being voice or text (col. 7, lines 5-14).

In summary, Meermans teaches a system for receiving, translating and delivering a recorded message to a recipients mailbox, pager or internet address for retrieval. Meermans cannot route an incoming IPNT call to a recipient's computer workstation as taught in applicant's claim 2. More importantly, Meermans does not have a facility for a recipient to access and edit (change) routing rules at the server. Applicant has clearly

shown that the art of Meermans does not come close to the teachings of applicant's claim 2. Applicant respectfully requests the art of Meermans be withdrawn. Claim 2 is clearly patentable over the art of Meermans. Claims 3-9 are now patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 10 herein recites:

10. In a customer premises Internet Protocol Network Telephony call center having a managing processor for switching received calls to LAN-connected computer workstations, a method for individual customization of routing rules for the received calls, comprising steps of:

(a) executing a client user interface on one of the computer workstations;

(b) determining routing for the received calls addressed to the computer workstation at the computer workstation using the client user interface;

(c) transmitting the routing determination to a router executing on a processor coupled to the LAN; and

(d) routing the received telephone calls by the router according to the transmitted routing determination.

Claim 10 has also been rejected by the Examiner under 102(e) using the art of Meermans. The Examiner states that Figure 3 of Meermans teaches a caller's mailbox (customer premises). The customer's mailbox in Meermans is stored at the Phone Mail Unit **104** for customer retrieval of voice messages (col.5 lines 34-37). Text messages

may be stored at a paging device, e-mailbox or at an internet address for later retrieval by the customer. Meermans does not route received calls to LAN-connected computer workstations, according to routing rules individually customized by the intended recipient of the incoming call as clearly disclosed in applicant's claim 10. There is no purpose or reason for message recipients in the art of Meermans to change or alter routing rules. Meermans limits routing possibilities by restricting voice calls, translated or not, to be held in the customer's mailbox at the Phone Mail Unit **104** (col. 6 lines 49-55). **A text message** may be routed to the conventional mailbox, a pager, e-mail or an internet address. The customer's account information (held in phone mail unit 104) will indicate to the communications assistant **124** that the text message should be routed to a predetermined alternative mailbox, ie. Pager, e-mail etc.(Col. 7 lines 1-14).

Meermans does not provide a <u>client user interface executing on a computer workstation.</u> Meermans teaches a communications assistant (translator) having a console translating recorded messages and advancing the messages to one of the customer's predetermined destinations according to the customer's account. Meermans cannot determine routing for the received call addressed to the computer workstation <u>at the computer workstation</u> using the client user interface, transmitting the routing determination to a router executing on a processor coupled to a LAN, and routing the received telephone call by the router according to the transmitted routing determination.

Claim 10 is clearly patentable over the art of Meermans as argued above and also as argued on behalf of claim 1. Claims 11-12 are now patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claim 13 is also rejected by the Examiner under 102(e) using the art of Meermans. Claim 13 discloses a call router system for determining routing of incoming Internet Protocol Network Telephony calls in a customer premises call center. Claim 13 has some of the same limitations argued on behalf of claim 10 above including a client user interface executable on one of the computer workstations, and adapted to provide functions for editing routing rules for individual specific users. Therefore claim 13 is also patentable over the art of Meermans. Claims 14-18 are patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims standing for examination as amended have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

Igor Neyman, et al.

by_____

Donald R. Boys

Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(408) 726-1457